



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,487	01/23/2004	Andrew Grace	MWS-095	7020

74321 7590 03/11/2008
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP/THE MATHWORKS
One Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109-2127

EXAMINER

MITCHELL, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2193

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/763,487	Applicant(s) GRACE, ANDREW	
	Examiner Jason Mitchell	Art Unit 2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14,16,18,20-24,26-32 and 34-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14,16,18,20-24,26-32 and 34-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-2, 4-14, 16, 18, 20-24, 26-32 are 34-51 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1 and 41

In the first paragraph of section V.A on pg. 14, the Applicant asserts:

Davis does not disclose ... "identifying an output description that corresponds with he input description, the output description being associated with a second cross-reference that matches the first cross-reference."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As indicated in the rejection Davis discloses matching cross-references as claimed (see e.g. col. 14, lines 42-47 "The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through translation 430, [and] source 434 ... relationships ... The relationships are ... stored by pointers from and to the related elements").

Claims 11 and 44

In the first paragraph of section V.C on pg. 15, the Applicant asserts:

Davis does not disclose "displaying a first cursor in an input description" and "displaying a second cursor automatically in the output description," ... Davis does not disclose cursors displayed in an input description and corresponding output description.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Initially it is noted that the Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Specifically, the Applicant has not addressed the rejection of the limitation as previously presented in claim 19.

Further, as discussed in the rejection, those of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized a 'cursor' to be equivalent to a selection containing 0 characters (or alternately 1 in the case of a cursor configured to overwrite the next character). Accordingly, displaying the claimed cursors would have been an obvious variation of the displayed 'selections' disclosed by Davis (e.g. col. 8, lines 17-17 "In response to a user selection of an element, the corresponding source and translation elements 84 are highlighted").

Claims 20 and 47

In the first paragraph of section V.E bridging pp. 15-16, the Applicant asserts:

Davis does not disclose "connecting a portion in the first segment and a corresponding portion in the second segment through a connection line to indicate that the connected portions in the first and second segments are corresponding to each other"

And, regarding claim 25 (see the 5th par. of Section XI on pg. 22) goes on to assert:

Sites ... does not disclose or suggest that a portion in the first segment and a corresponding portion in the second segment are connected through a connection line ... The dotted line of Sites connects the blocks in the same flowgraph.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Davis discloses indicating a correspondence between a first segment and a corresponding portion in the second segment (e.g. col. 8, lines 17-17 "In response to a user selection of an element, the corresponding source and translation elements 84 are highlighted") but does not do so using a line. Sites discloses the use of a line for indicating a correspondence between code portions (Fig. 16, 214). Accordingly, as discussed in the rejection below, the claimed limitation would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Davis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 31, 34-40 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,829,759 to Davis et al. (Davis).

Regarding Claims 1 and 41: Davis discloses an electronic device running a software tool that generates output descriptions in response to input descriptions a method for tracing output descriptions generated from corresponding input descriptions (col. 6,

Art Unit: 2193

lines 21-22 The translator 46 translates the source elements ... into translation elements”), wherein the electronic device includes a display (Fig. 3), the method comprising:

identifying a first cross-reference associated with an input description (col. 14, lines 42-47 “The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through translation 430 ... relationships ... The relationships are ... stored by pointers from and to the related elements”; also see fig. 14);

identifying an output description that corresponds with the input description, the output description being associated with a second cross-reference that matches the first cross-reference (col. 14, lines 42-47 “The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through ... source 434 ... relationships”; also see fig. 14); and

displaying the input descriptions and the output descriptions together on the display (col. 8, lines 6-8 “The source window 74 displays the source elements 86, while the translation window 76 displays the translation elements 88”);

Regarding Claim 2: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the input and output descriptions include code descriptions expressed in programming languages (col. 5, lines 5-6 “translates between assembly language files”).

Regarding Claim 5: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the input descriptions and the output descriptions are displayed in separate panes of a

same window (col. 7, lines 51-54 “a graphical interface window 72 having a source window 74 [and] a translation window 76”).

Regarding Claim 6: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the input description and the output description are displayed in separate windows (col. 7, lines 51-54 “a source window 74 [and] a translation window 76”).

Regarding Claim 7: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Davis discloses:

providing a first scrolling tool for scrolling the input description (Fig. 3; col. 8, lines 14-16 “Synchronized scroll bars 92 are provided for the windows 74”); and

providing a second scrolling tool for scrolling the output description (Fig. 3; col. 8, lines 14-16 “Synchronized scroll bars 92 are provided for the windows ... 76”).

Regarding Claims 8 and 42: The rejection of claims 7 and 41 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the first and second scrolling tool includes scrolling bars (Fig. 3; col. 8, lines 14-16 “Synchronized scroll bars 92”).

Regarding Claims 9 and 43: The rejection of claims 7 and 42 is incorporated; further Davis discloses in response to controlling one of the first scrolling bar or the second scrolling bar, the other scrolling bar is automatically controlled in proportion to a controlled amount in said one of the first scrolling bar and the second scrolling bar (Fig.

3; col. 8, lines 14-16 “Synchronized scroll bars 92 ... maintain alignment during any review and modification by the user”).

Regarding Claim 10: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Davis discloses, in response to scrolling one of the input descriptions or the output descriptions, displaying corresponding input descriptions and output descriptions adjacent to the scrolled descriptions on the display (col. 8, lines 14-16 “maintain alignment”).

Regarding Claim 31: Davis discloses a system for translating input code to output code, the system comprising:

- a display (e.g. Fig. 3); and

- a processor configured to:

- identify a first cross-reference associated with input code (col. 14, lines 42-47 “The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through translation 430 ... relationships),

- identify output code that corresponds to the input code (col. 6, lines 21-22 “The translator 46 translates the source elements ... into translation elements”), the output code being associated with a second cross-reference associated with a second cross-reference that matches the first cross-reference (col. 14, lines 42-47 “The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through ... source 434 ... relationships”); and

display the input code and the output code together on the display using the input and output code markup files (Fig. 3),

Regarding Claim 34: The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the cross-references include line references to each line of the input code and corresponding line of the output code (Fig. 15; col. 17, lines “The hash entries 478 include a source line number 486”).

Regarding Claim 35: The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the cross-references include line references to each line of the output code and corresponding line of input code (Fig. 15; col. 17, lines “The hash entries 478 include a source line number 486”).

Regarding Claim 36: The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the cross-references include references to an element of the input code and a corresponding output code element (col. 14, lines 26-31 “source and corresponding translation instructions are associated with each other”).

Regarding Claim 37: The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the cross-references include references to an element of the output code and a corresponding input code element (col. 14, lines 26-31 “source and corresponding translation instructions are associated with each other”).

Regarding Claim 38: The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the display tool provides a graphical user interface element in which the input code and the output code are displayed together (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 39: The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the processor is further configured to display the input output code in separate windows (col. 7, lines 51-54 “a source window 74 [and] a translation window 76”).

Regarding Claim 40: The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the input code and the output code are described in a textual format (Fig. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,829,759 to Davis et al. (Davis) in view of US 2003/0023755 to Harris et al. (Harris).

Regarding Claim 4: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the input description and the output description are expressed in different dialects of a programming language (e.g. col. 5, lines 20-24 “In the assembly language embodiment, the translation system 10 may convert an assembly language file for one device into an assembly language file for another device”).

Harris teaches the input description and the output description are expressed in a different programming language (par. [0007] “a variety of different mobile device markup languages”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Davis’ system (e.g. col. 5, lines 20-24 “the translation system 10 may convert”) to express the input and output description in different programming languages, as taught by Harris (par. [0007]). Those of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such changes in order to “[allow] the distribution of uniform content to multiple types of requesting devices” (Harris par. [0007]).

Claims 11-14, 16 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,829,759 to Davis et al. (Davis).

Regarding Claims 11 and 44: Davis discloses, in an electronic device running a software tool that generates output descriptions in response to input descriptions, a

Art Unit: 2193

method for tracing an output description generated from a corresponding input description (col. 6, lines 21-22 “The translator 46 translates the source elements ... into translation elements”), wherein the electronic device includes a display (Fig. 3), the method comprising:

- displaying the input descriptions and the output descriptions together on the display (col. 8, lines 6-8 “The source window 74 displays the source elements 86, while the translation window 76 displays the translation elements 88”);

- displaying a first selection of a first element of one of the input descriptions or the output description (col. 8, lines 17-17 “In response to a user selection of an element”);

- identifying a first cross-reference associated with the first element (col. 14, lines 42-47 “The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through translation 430 ... relationships”);

- identifying a second element of the other description that corresponds with the first element, the second element being associated with a second cross reference that matches the first cross-reference (col. 14, lines 42-47 “The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through ... source 434 ... relationships”); and

- displaying a second selection in a second element (col. 8, lines 17-17 “In response to a user selection of an element, the corresponding source and translation elements 84 are highlighted”).

Davis does not explicitly disclose displaying a first cursor in a first element and displaying a second cursor in a second element.

Those of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a cursor is equivalent to a selection of zero characters. Thus it would at least have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the functionality disclosed in relation to Davis' 'selections' for a cursor (i.e. a selection of length 0) in order to assist in the disclosed editing. (col. 21, lines 35-37 "an intuitive display is provided by which the user is able to efficiently review, modify and save a translation").

Regarding Claim 12: The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the first cursor and the second cursor are presented in a start position of the input description and the output description (col. 15, lines 47-54 "determining a source start element").

Regarding Claim 13: The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the first cursor and the second cursor are presented on a same line on the display (col. 8, lines 14-16 "maintain alignment during any review and modification by the user").

Regarding Claim 14: The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the first and second cursors are presented in a middle of the input description and the output description. (Fig. 3, Selection 94)

Regarding Claim 45: The rejection of claim 44 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the input description and the output description which the first focus and the second focus are presented to, respectively, make cross-references to each other (col. 14, lines 26-31 “source and corresponding translation instructions are associated with each other”).

Regarding Claims 16 and 46: The rejection of claims 11 and 45 are incorporated; further Davis discloses the cross-references include reference numbers to the input description and the output description (col. 17, lines “The hash entries 478 include a source line number 486”).

Claims 18, 32 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,829,759 to Davis et al. (Davis) in view of “Towards Portable Source Code Representations Using XML” by Mamas et al. (Mamas).

Regarding Claim 18: The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated; further Davis does not disclose his cross references are attached to the input description and the output description using the XML.

Mamas teaches attaching meta-data to a source code description using the XML (Extensible Markup Language) programming language (pg. 175. the par. bridging cols.

1 and 2 “XML-based program representation in which the corresponding DOM trees represent source code information”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attach Davis’ cross references to the input and output descriptions (col. 14, lines 26-30 “source and corresponding translation instructions are associated with each other”) using XML as taught by Mamas (pg. 175. the par. bridging cols. 1 and 2 “annotated source code in the form of a DOM”) because “source code representation schemes must be compact, accessible by well defined application programming interfaces (APIs) and above all portable to different operation platforms and various CASE tools” (Mamas Abstract)

Regarding Claim 32: the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the processor is further configured to:

generate an input code file and an output code file, the input code markup file containing the first cross-reference associated with the input code (col. 14, lines 42-47 “The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through translation 430 ... relationships”), and the output code markup file containing the second cross-reference associated with the output code (col. 14, lines 42-47 “The source and translation elements 442 and 426 ... are associated with each other through ... source 434 ... relationships”).

Davis does not disclose the input code file and output code file being 'markup' files.

Mamas teaches attaching meta-data to a source code description using the XML (Extensible Markup Language) programming language (pg. 175. the par. bridging cols. 1 and 2 "XML-based program representation in which the corresponding DOM trees represent source code information").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to represent Davis' cross references associated with the input and output descriptions (col. 14, lines 26-30 "source and corresponding translation instructions are associated with each other") using XML as taught by Mamas (pg. 175. the par. bridging cols. 1 and 2 "annotated source code in the form of a DOM") because "source code representation schemes must be compact, accessible by well defined application programming interfaces (APIs) and above all portable to different operation platforms and various CASE tools" (Mamas Abstract).

Regarding Claims 50 and 51: The rejection of claims 1 and 41 are incorporated; further, Davis does not disclose the first cross-reference and the second cross-reference are coded in the Extensible Markup Language (XML) programming language.

Mamas teaches attaching meta-data to a source code description using the XML (Extensible Markup Language) programming language (pg. 175. the par. bridging cols. 1 and 2 “XML-based program representation in which the corresponding DOM trees represent source code information”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to represent Davis’ cross references associated with the input and output descriptions (col. 14, lines 26-30 “source and corresponding translation instructions are associated with each other”) using XML as taught by Mamas (pg. 175. the par. bridging cols. 1 and 2 “annotated source code in the form of a DOM”) because “source code representation schemes must be compact, accessible by well defined application programming interfaces (APIs) and above all portable to different operation platforms and various CASE tools” (Mamas Abstract).

Claims 20-21, 23, 26-29 and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,829,759 to Davis et al. (Davis) in view of US 5,507,030 to Sites (Sites).

Regarding Claims 20 and 47: Davis discloses an electronic device running a software tool that generates output descriptions in response to input descriptions, a method for tracing an output description generated from a corresponding input description (col. 6, lines 21-22 The translator 46 translates the source elements ... into translation

elements”), wherein the electronic device includes a display (Fig. 3), the method comprising:

displaying the input descriptions and the output descriptions together on the display (col. 8, lines 6-8 “The source window 74 displays the source elements 86, while the translation window 76 displays the translation elements 88”);

selecting a first segment in one of the input description and the output description (col. 8, lines 17-17 “In response to a user selection of an element”); and

in response to selecting a first segment in the one of the input descriptions or the output descriptions, selecting a second segment in the other descriptions automatically, the second segment corresponding to the first segment (col. 8, lines 17-17 “In response to a user selection of an element, the corresponding source and translation elements 84 are highlighted”); and

indicating a connection between a portion in the first segment and a corresponding portion in the second segment to indicate that the connected portions in the first and second segments correspond to each other (col. 8, lines 17-17 “In response to a user selection of an element, the corresponding source and translation elements 84 are highlighted”).

Davis does not disclose indicating the connection through a connection line.

Sites teaches indicating a first and second segment are associated with each other through a connection line (Fig. 16, 214).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the connection line taught by Sites (Fig. 16, 214). Those of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification as an obvious alternate method of indicating the association between Davis' input and output descriptions so that "translation element 88 may be immediately identified with its source element 86". (Davis col. 8, lines 19-22).

Regarding Claim 21: The rejection of claim 20 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the first segment or the second segment is highlighted (col. 8, lines 17-17 "elements 94 are highlighted").

Regarding Claims 23, 28 and 49: The rejection of claims 20, 23 and 48 are incorporated, respectively; further, Davis discloses each of a plurality of lines makes a different reference to corresponding lines in the second segment (Fig. 15 see e.g. S₁ and S₂)

The Davis-Sites combination does not explicitly disclose the first segment includes a plurality of lines however, it would at least have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to extend Davis' explicitly disclosed

single line selection (Fig. 3, selection 94) to include multiple lines (e.g. Fig. 16 partition 452) so that “corresponding groups of source and translation elements 452 and 456 can be [highlighted and] aligned for display to the user” (col. 15, lines 35-37).

Regarding Claims 26 and 48: The rejections of claims 20 and 47 are incorporated; further Davis discloses the input description in the first segment and the corresponding output description in the second segment make cross-references to each other (col. 14, lines 26-30 “source and corresponding translation instructions are associated with each other”).

Regarding Claim 27: The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated; further Davis discloses the first segment includes a part of a line in the input descriptions and the part of the line in the first segment makes a different reference to a corresponding part of a line in the second segment (col. 4, lines 57-60 “the translation machine description 36 maps instructions and their associated operands from the source files 24 and 26 to the translation files 28 and 30”).

Regarding Claim 29: The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated; further Davis discloses multiple references are made to a common line in the second segment, the common line being shared by more than one line in the second segment (col. 15, lines 1-4 “Since more than one translation element 426 may be generated from a single source element

422, a plurality of translation relationships 430 may refer to a single source element 422”).

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,829,759 to Davis et al. (Davis) in view of US 5,507,030 to Sites (Sites) in view of Official Notice.

Regarding Claim 22: The rejection of claim 20 is incorporated; further the Davis-Sites combination does not explicitly disclose that the background of the selected segment (Fig. 3, 94) is colored.

However, Official notice is taken that those of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized a colored background as an obvious method of providing the highlighting discussed, for example, in col. 8, lines 17-18 and shown in Fig. 3.

Claims 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,829,759 to Davis et al. (Davis) in view of US 5,507,030 to Sites (Sites) in view of US 5,797,011 to Kroll et al. (Kroll).

Regarding Claim 24: The rejection of claim 23 is incorporated; further the Davis-Sites combination does not disclose the plurality of lines is highlighted in different colors.

Kroll discloses using color to indicate distinctions between translation elements (col. 6, line 67-col. 7, line 4 “displayed in a manner, such as using different colors, that indicates that the related target part is not to be translated with the target panel”)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to highlight each element of plurality of Davis's lines (e.g. Fig. 16, S₁₋₃ of partition 452) in a different color as taught by Kroll (col. 6, line 67-col. 7, line 4 “displayed in a manner, such as using different colors, ... indicates”) to accurately represent the mapping disclosed by Davis (see e.g. Fig. 15, S₁₋₃ and T₁₋₃).

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,829,759 to Davis et al. (Davis) in view of US 5,507,030 to Sites (Sites) in view of “Towards Portable Source Code Representations Using XML” by Mamas et al. (Mamas).

Regarding Claim 30: The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated; further the Davis-Sites combination does not disclose his cross references are attached to the input description and the output description using the XML.

Mamas teaches attaching meta-data to a source code description using the XML (Extensible Markup Language) programming language (pg. 175. the par. bridging cols.

1 and 2 “XML-based program representation in which the corresponding DOM trees represent source code information”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attach Davis’ cross references to the input and output descriptions (col. 14, lines 26-30 “source and corresponding translation instructions are associated with each other”) using XML as taught by Mamas (pg. 175. the par. bridging cols. 1 and 2 “annotated source code in the form of a DOM”) because “source code representation schemes must be compact, accessible by well defined application programming interfaces (APIs) and above all portable to different operation platforms and various CASE to

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2193

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bullock Lewis can be reached on (571) 272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Mitchell/
2/25/08

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193